

From: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
To: [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [POULSEN Mike](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#)
Cc: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: A major ecorisk misstatement in the Portland Harbor Partnership's presentation on the Portland Harbor Superfund site
Date: 01/11/2012 05:22 PM

Burt,
That's the big question..., do we weigh-in on the content of the PH Partnership's material? I'd feel much more comfortable if the message they gave was nearly the same message we'd give..., but I don't know if we could get that close. The thing that concerns me most about offering edits is that they would then likely say "EPA-approved".
Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Burt Shephard [mailto:Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 2:15 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike; ANDERSON Jim M; MCCLINCY Matt
Cc: humphrey.chip@epa.gov; Kristine Koch; Goulet.Joe@epa.gov
Subject: A major ecorisk misstatement in the Portland Harbor Partnership's presentation on the Portland Harbor Superfund site

All,

Just got done listening to the presentation by the Portland Harbor Partnership (PHP) to ODEQ. There is at least one egregious mistake in their presentation of ecological risk at the site on Slide 11 of their presentation.

The specific mistake is in the following statement: "Approximately 7% of the ten mile site is potentially toxic to bugs" (boldface and italics included on original PHP slide)

Leaving aside the veracity of the 7% value, which varies depending on which sediment toxicity test species and level of toxicity one chooses (reference, low, moderate, severe toxicity; or Level 0, 1, 2, 3 toxicity), the word potentially needs to be struck from the slide. We have multiple site samples and sediment toxicity tests where decreased survivorship, growth and biomass have been measured. There is nothing potential about sediment toxicity at Portland Harbor, we have empirical data that measured and demonstrated toxicity of some site sediments to "bugs".

The question now is how to handle this. Do we take up the PHP's offer for the agencies to inform them of such mistakes, or do we allow them to continue making these types of errors, which ultimately serves to reduce the credibility of the PHP?

Best regards,

Burt Shephard
Risk Evaluation Unit
Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 1200
6th Avenue Seattle, WA 98101

Telephone: (206) 553-6359
Fax: (206) 553-0119

e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov

"For every problem, there is one solution which is simple, neat and wrong"
- H.L. Mencken

(See attached file: PHP presentation Slide 11 011112.JPG)